

The Address

their immediate needs and would not give them any serious long-term hopes for the future because there was no reflection of cost of production in the formula that was used to set the basis for support in GRIP.

We have the previous minister talking about competitiveness. We believe in a competitive economy. It is our only hope for the future as a country. However, the question is how do we build competitiveness. Do we build competitiveness by destroying factories and jobs with a free trade deal? Do we build competitiveness by cutting back \$100 million in training in the last budget? Do we build competitiveness by reducing support for the National Research Council? Surely not.

What we should do to achieve competitiveness as a country in the future is build a country based on the abilities of its people. To do that, we must end poverty in this country. We must do something to give us more equality in Canada. We must change financial support to give people a sense of security in their health and educational support.

What else? There should have been a commitment to reduce the value of the dollar, a commitment to establish an economic recovery fund which would respond to local community-based initiatives, a commitment to investment in the future of our country.

The speech talks about setting partisan motives aside. This government has not set aside a single one of the partisan commitments which it has forced down the throats of Canadians in this past seven years. It has not rejected the free trade agreement. It has not questioned the GST. It has not questioned the tax changes it has made to benefit the rich. It has not questioned the cutbacks in VIA, the cutbacks in the CBC, the cutbacks in institution after institution that are crucial for our country's future.

Yet it says: "Come on guys, be non-partisan, give us a break". This country has no business giving this government a break. What this country should do is give this government the boot, not give it any kind of break, because it has jammed partisan objectives down the throats of Canadians which can simply not be accepted.

I therefore move a subamendment to the previous amendment as follows. I move, seconded by the member for Skeena:

That the amendment be amended by adding the following words after "economic affairs of the nation" in the previous amendment: "as demonstrated by the absence of any new initiatives to respond to widespread human distress caused by your government's economic policies and by the reliance on yet another parliamentary committee in the next round of constitutional discussions".

• (1210)

Mr. Peter L. McCreath (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Finance and Privatization)): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to my hon. friend from Windsor. There is something in his remarks that leaves me a little confused and I would like to put a question to him with respect to this.

He frequently speaks of the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement and seems to feel that this has had a negative impact on the Canadian economy, something which I have some difficulty understanding. It is my understanding that possibly my hon. friend feels that, in fact, the Canadian market within itself is large enough to meet all the needs of Canadian manufacturers such that we need never sell anything outside of Canada.

It is my understanding that the way trade opportunities go is through mutual accords of one sort or another. Therefore, if the means to the growth in the Canadian economy, if the means to the creation of substantive employment possibilities is in having access to markets that will allow our businesses and industries to grow, the logical means is to set up trade accords that give us access to those markets. They reasonably are going to want access back to ours.

Therefore, my question to the hon. member is this. If it is his intent that Canada should not open up trade with other countries of the world, if Canada should not access the opportunities for growth and expansion in competitive Canadian industries, how does he propose to have the Canadian economy grow, if we are going to confine ourselves to having higher and higher and higher walls put around our country?

Mr. Langdon: Mr. Speaker, I must say that is a remarkable question for somebody to put, given the debate which has taken place in this country over the trade deal for many years. It has been our position